

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. By this Amendment, claims 1-2, 4-11 are amended and claim 3 is canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. Support for the amendments can be found, at least, in the figures and from page 10, line 12 to page 31, line 4 in the specification. No new matter is introduced by this Amendment.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In the Office Action, claims 1-3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by US 5,050,218 to Ikeda (hereinafter called “Ikeda”). Claim 3 has been canceled. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to show that Ikeda discloses all the claimed limitations recited in claims 1 and 2.

Ikeda merely discloses only one set of a keyword dictionary and an address word dictionary for SINGAPORE. The specification of Ikeda states, “In order to achieve a high-speed address recognition processing, it is effective practice to register (and indicates a bit to) a keyword which frequently appears in address descriptions, for example, ‘SINGAPORE’ which appears on most mail articles handled in Singapore (See FIG. 7).” (Column 6, Lines 63-68). Thus “SINGAPORE” at Table 1 in Ikeda is used merely as a city name rather than a country name.

Even assuming without prejudice or disclaimer that SINGAPORE is used as a country name, Ikeda merely discloses a conventional address recognition apparatus for one country. Ikeda does not disclose that an apparatus stores dictionaries and recognition procedures of a plurality of countries.

Thus, Ikeda does not disclose the limitation “storing means storing dictionaries of a plurality of countries and recognition procedures of a plurality of countries, each of said

recognition procedures corresponding to each category of the hierarchical structure with a plurality of stages of the location information” recited in claim 1. Also, Ikeda does not disclose the limitation “storing dictionaries of a plurality of countries and recognition procedures of a plurality of countries, each of said recognition procedures corresponding to each category of the hierarchical structure with a plurality of stages of the location information” recited in claim 2.

Thus, the rejection should respectfully be withdrawn at least because the Office Action fails to show that Ikeda discloses all the limitations of claims 1 and 2.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, claims 4 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ikeda in view of US 6,266,431 to Yui (hereinafter “Yui”).

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, all of the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. The Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to show that all the claimed limitations are taught or suggested by the prior art.

As mentioned above, Ikeda merely discloses a conventional address recognition apparatus for one country. Also, Yui merely discloses a conventional mail processing system for one country.

The Office Action fails to show that the combination of Ikeda and Yui teaches or suggests the above limitation recited in claim 1. Claims 4 and 8-11 depend from claim 1.

Thus, the rejection should respectfully withdrawn at least because the Office Action fails to show that the combination of Ikeda and Yui teaches or suggests all the limitations of claims 4 and 8-11.

Claim Objections


In the Office Action, claim 9 was objected to because of informalities. The definition of IC is added as "Integrated Circuit" at page 15, line 5 in the specification. Also, claim 9 is amended without prejudice or disclaimer. Thus the objection should respectfully be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 5-7 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claim 5 is amended to be independent forms with some changes. Claims 6-7 depend from claim 5. Regardless of the changes, the objection should respectfully be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All rejections and objections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP


JEFFREY D. KARCESKI
Reg. No. 35,914
Tel. No. (703) 905-2110
GLENN T. BARRETT
Reg. No. 38,705
Tel. No. (703) 905-2011
Fax No. (703) 905-2500

Date: April 12, 2004
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 905-2000